DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 552 EA 021 323

AUTHOR Valentine, Jerry W.; Bowman, Michael L.
TITLE Principal Effectiveness in "National Recognition" Schools. A Research Project Summary Report.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 18p.; For related documents, see EA 021 324-325.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Evaluation; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Excellence in Education; *Leadership Qualities; *Principals; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Audit of Principal Effectiveness; School Recognition Program

ABSTRACT

Between 1982 and 1987, 1,500 outstanding schools were recognized by the School Recognition Program, based on an analysis of their leadership, order and discipline, community support, and high standards and expectations for all students. Following the assumption that the recognized schools collectively represent some of America's better elementary and secondary institutions, the administrative skills of the recognized schools' principals were studied and contrasted to the administrative skills of randomly selected school principals. During the 1987-88 school year, packets containing Audit of Principal Effectiveness surveys were mailed to 483 of the 1986-87 recognized school principals for distribution among 10 of their teachers; and 375 identical packets were mailed to randomly selected schools (from seven different geographic regions) for distribution. For inclusion in the study, at least five of the school's teachers had to return completed surveys; the response rate was 36 percent from recognized schools, and 35 percent from the random sample. Results indicate that clearly, the teachers of the recognized schools perceive their principals as more effective than teachers of the random schools. The pattern of differences between the perceptions of the teachers surveyed in this study supports the belief that more effective schools are administered by more effective principals. (5 references) (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311552

Principal Effectiveness in "National Recognition" Schools

A
Research Project
Summary Report

Prepared by
Jerry W. Valentine
and
Michael L. Bowman

July 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry W. Valentine

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Department of Educational Administration
218 Hill Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211

EA 021 323

Principal Effectiveness in "National Recognition" Schools

In 1982, Secretary of Education Terrence Bell created the School Recognition Program. The first three years of the Program were devoted to the recognition of secondary schools. In 1986 elementary schools were recognized for the time, thus beginning a pattern of alternating years for elementary and secondary recognition. From analysis of issues such as leadership, order and discipline, community support, and high standards and expectations for all students, more than 1500 schools were recognized during the first five years the program (USDE, 1987).

The purpose of the program is to identify and honor America's outstanding public and private schools and encourage other schools and communities to look to the recognized schools for ideas and inspiration. To receive recognition, a school must be nominated by the Chief School Officer of the state, the Council for American Private Education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or the Department of Defense Dependent Schools and survive a rigorous screening of the school's report and an on-site visit. A review panel recommends to the Secretary of Education those schools which best meet specifically stated outcome measures and attributes of success identified in research studies about effective schooling (USDE, 1987).

Given the rigors of the nomination and review process, it is safe to assume that most of the schools selected by the Recognition Program are successfully meeting the needs of their community. It is also safe to assume that the Recognized Schools collectively represent some of the better elementary and secondary schools in American education. Operating from these assumptions of quality about the schools, and the voluminous research and literature which document the important role of the principal in a successful school, we studied the administrative skills of principals from the "recognized" schools and principals from of a random sample of schools across the United States. The findings provided a portrait of the skills the principals of "recognized" and "typical" schools, and the opportunity to contrast the differences between the two groups.

Data were collected for the study during the 1987-88 school year. The principal of each school "recognized" in 1986 and 1987 was mailed a packet of information asking the school personnel to participate in the study and providing ten copies of the assessment instrument and directions for selecting ten teachers on the staff to complete the instrument. This represented a survey of 483 schools, of which 212 were elementary schools recognized in 1986 and 271 were secondary schools recognized in 1987. For a school to be used in the study, at least five teacher responses must have been received for that school. The teacher responses were averaged to represent school scores. Useable data were returned from 58 elementary schools and 116 secondary schools for a total response of 174 schools. The relatively low response rate was not surprising given the degree

to which those schools were inundated with requests for information and data; the fact that some schools had new principals and therefore could not be used in the study; and, the strictly voluntary nature of the request without any follow-up pressure to participate. The response rate was large enough to statistically analyze the results and not of conceptual concern to the study because the application of common standards and criteria for selection provided a group of schools meeting the basic assumption of "exemplary."

During the 1987-88 school year, 375 schools from across the nation were randomly selected as a control group. The schools were selected by seven geographic regions to ensure representation from all areas of the country and by grade level to ensure representation from elementary, middle and high school programs. The teachers of those schools were asked to respond to the same assessment instrument sent to the "recognized" schools. The process for identifying the teachers and the criterion of at least five responses per school were again followed. Of the 125 elementary schools surveyed, 43 provided useable returns. The 250 secondary schools were subdivided by middle level and high schools, with 43 of 125 useable responses from the middle level schools and 73 of 125 from the high schools. The response rate of 35% from the random sample was almost identical to the 36% response from the recognized sample.

The instrument used to collect the data about the principals was the Audit of Principal Effectiveness. The instrument was developed in 1984 to describe the leadership skills of building administrators. The instrument has eighty items which provide data for nine factors of principal effectiveness. The factors are grouped by Domains which represent general areas of administrative responsibility. The factors describe the research based, conceptual issues which statistically and logically evolved during the analysis of the items related to principal effectiveness. The factor scores are computed from the responses of teachers asked to describe "how effectively you perceive your principal performs each of the skills." A Likert-type scale of one (not effective) to nine (very effective) is used (Bowman and Valentine, 1987).

Listed below are the domain and factor definitions for the Audit of Principal Effectiveness.

Domain: Organizational Development

The Domain of Organizational Development provides insight into the ability of the principal to work with personnel inside and outside the school setting to establish processes and relationships that most effectively promote positive growth and change of the organization as a whole. The specific factors for Organizational Development are defined below.

Factor: Organizational Direction

The principal provides direction for the school through work with faculty members to develop goals, establish expectations and promote appropriate change.

Factor: Organizational Linkage

The principal promotes positive working relationships between the school, the community the school serves and other educators and agencies which work with the school.

Factor: Organizational Procedures

The principal utilizes effective procedures for problem-solving, decision-making and change.

Domain: Organizational Environment

The Domain of Organizational Environment provides insight into the ability of the principal to nurture the on-going climate of the school through development of positive interpersonal relationships among members of the organization and effective day-by-day operational procedures for the school. The specific factors for Organizational Environment are defined below.

Factor: Teacher Relations

The principal develops effective working relationships with staff through appropriate communication skills, sensitivity to needs, appropriate support and reinforcement.

Factor: Student Relations

The principal develops effective working relationships with students through appropriate communication skills, encouragement, support and high visibility.

Factor: Interactive Processes

The principal organizes tasks and personnel for the effective day-by-day management of the school, including providing appropriate information to staff and students, developing appropriate rules and procedures and setting the overall tone for discipline in the school.

Factor: Affective Processes

The principal encourages the expression of feelings, opinions, pride and loyalty through team management, sensitivity, humor and personal example.

Domain: Educational Program

The Domain of Educational Program provides insight into the ability of the principal to serve as the educational leader of the school through active involvement in instructional leadership and curriculum development. The specific factors for Educational Program are defined below.

Factor: Instructional Improvement

The principal impacts positively upon instructional skills through effective clinical supervision, knowledge of effective schooling and commitment to quality instruction.

Factor: Curriculum Improvement

The principal promotes an articulated, outcome-based curriculum through diagnosis of student needs and systematic program review and change (Bowman and Valentine, 1987).

Effectiveness Ratings for Principals of Recognized Schools

The factor scores for the principals of the recognized schools are presented in Table 1. The teachers of all of the responding schools described their principals as most effective for the factors of Organizational Direction (7.8), Interactive Processes (7.8) and Organizational Linkage (7.7). This implies that the principals were perceived as strongest in "providing direction for the school," "organizing tasks and personnel for the effective day-by-day management of the school," and "promoting positive working relationships between the school, the community the school serves and other educators and agencies which work with the school." Of the eighty items on the Audit, eight of the ten highest scoring items were from these three factors.

The item with the most positive teacher response was from the factor Organizational Direction. The item read: "The principal has high, professional expectations and standards for self, faculty and school." Also from the factor of Organizational Direction was the fifth highest item: "The principal envisions future goals and directions for the school." From the factor of Interactive Processes, two items had scores among the top ten items: "The principal is able to organize activities, tasks and people," and "The principal establishes a process by which students are made aware of school rules and policies."

The factor of Organizational Linkage had four items in the top ten. They were: "The principal is supportive of, and operates within, the policies of the district;" "The principal maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with other administrators of the district;" "The principal develops and implements school practices and policies which synthesize educational mandates, requirements and theories;" and, "The principal strives to achieve autonomy for the school."

The third highest scoring item was from the factor of Instructional Improvement. The item read: "The principal is committed to instructional improvement." The fourth rated item was from the factor of Teacher Relations: "Through effective management of the day-by-day operation of the school, the principal promotes, among staff, parents and community, a feeling of confidence in the school."

Table 1
Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores by Grade Level for Nationally Recognized Schools in 1986/87

Domains and Factors	Grade Levels ELEM. N=58	JH/MS N=43	H.S. N=73	ALL N=174
Organizational Development				
Organizational Direction	8.1	7.9	7.6	7.8
Organizational Linkage	8.0	7.7	7.6	7.7
Organizational Procedures	7.7	7.1	7.2	7.3
Organizational Environment				
Teacher Relations	7.7	7.3	7.4	7.5
Student Relations	7.7	7.2	7.5	7.5
Interactive Processes	8.0	7.7	7.6	7.8
Affective Processes	7.6	7.1	7.1	7.3
Educational Program				
Instructional Improvement	7.9	7.5	7.3	7.6
Curriculum Improvement	7.8	7.4	7.2	7.5

These factors and items provide a portrait of principals who work with staff, parents and community to identify and work toward accomplishing specific goals for the school. The principals garner support for programs and manage the day-by-day operation of the school so effectively that teachers and parents develop a confidence that all is going smoothly. The principals have the confidence of the teachers and have developed good working relationships with the teachers. This is evident from the factor score of 7.5 for Teacher Relations. And, based upon the factor scores of 7.6 for Instructional Improvement and 7.5 for Curriculum Improvement, the principals are perceived as effective in those job skills associated with curriculum and instruction.

The factors of Affective Processes (7.3) and Organizational Procedures (7.3) were perceived as the least effective skills of the principals from the "recognized schools." These factors described the principals' abilities to "encourage the expression of feelings, opinions, pride and loyalty through team management, sensitivity, humor and personal example," and "utilize effective procedures for problem-solving, decision-making and change."

Of the 80 items, only four had scores below 7.0 for the

principals of the "recognized" schools. The item with the lowest score (6.20) was from the factor of Affective Processes. The score was more than one-half a point lower than any other item. The item read: "During meetings the principal involves persons who might otherwise not participate." Also from the factor of Affective Processes was the fifth lowest scoring item: "The principal helps teachers clarify their thoughts by discussing those thoughts with them." The factor or Organizational Procedures had the third lowest scoring item: "The principal utilizes a systematic process for change which is known and understood by the faculty." The second lowest scoring item (6.71) was from Instructional Improvement: "The principal has effective techniques for helping ineffective teachers." Two other relatively low scoring items are important to note. They were from the factor of Curriculum Improvement. The items were: "The principal uses objective data such as test scores to make changes in curriculum and staffing," and "The principal has a systematic process for program review and change."

A paradox arises from the scores for some of the higher and lower scoring items. The highest scoring items for the principals of the recognized schools imply the principals are perceived as skillful in working with staff and community to plot a course for the school and sail the ship on that course. However, the relatively low scores imply that skills in staff and program development are not present, not as apparent to faculty, or not as readily understood and recognized by the faculty.

An analysis of the factors by the grade levels of elementary, middle and high school provided interesting findings (Table 1). Generally, factors perceived by teachers as highly effective at one level were relatively high at all levels and those low at a level were relatively low for all levels. However, tests for statistically significant differences indicated that differences do exist among the factors at a given grade level. In particular, Organizational Direction, Organizational Linkage and Interactive Processes were significantly higher than Organizational Procedures, Teacher Relations, and Affective Processes at the elementary and middle levels. At the elementary and middle levels, Instructional Improvement and Curriculum Improvement were significantly lower than the scores for Organizational Direction and higher than the scores for Affective Processes. At the high school level, the scores for Organizational Direction and Interactive Processes were significantly higher than each of the other factors.

These tests of differences by level reinforce the notion that the principals of the recognized schools are perceived as most skilled in (a) providing direction for the school, (b) promoting the working relationships of the school among the community, and (c) providing for effective day-by-day management. They are perceived as least skilled in (a) utilizing effective procedures for problem-solving, decision-making and change, and (b) encouraging expressions of feelings and opinions.

When comparisons are made among the three levels of

elementary, middle and high school, the elementary principals consistently received higher ratings from their teachers. While it is apparent that the elementary teachers rated their elementary principals as more effective than the middle and high school principals, this study does not answer the question of whether the elementary principals are actually more skilled than their middle or high school counterparts. The ratings were made by different teachers and may represent different levels of expectations. Also, the complexity and size of the organizations may affect the ratings.

Contrasting Principals of Recognized and Randomly Selected Schools

Factors and items rated higher and lower by teachers of the "recognized" schools generally shared the same high or low rating from the teachers in the "random" schools. This phenomenon was apparent when the factors were arranged by rank order (Table 2). Only two differences were evident. The first difference was relatively minor, with the factors of Organizational Direction and Interactive Processes ranked first and second in the recognized group and second and first in the random group. The more noticeable difference was for the factors of Organizational Linkage and Student Relations. In the recognized group, Organizational Linkage had the third highest factor score and Student Relations the fifth highest. In the random group, their positions were reversed.

Table 2
Rank Order of Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores for Nationally Recognized Schools in 1986/87 and Randomly Selected Schools in 1987

Nationally Recognized Schools N=174	Randomly Selected Schools N=132
Organizational Direction (7.84)	Interactive Processes (7.39)
Interactive Processes (7.75)	Organizational Direction (7.31)
Organizational Linkage (7.72)	Student Relations (7.26)
Instructional Improvement (7.58)	Instructional Improvement (7.23)
Teacher Relations (7.50)	Teacher Relations (7.19)
Student Relations (7.48)	Organizational Linkage (7.18)
Curriculum Improvement (7.47)	Curriculum Improvement (7.03)
Organizational Procedures (7.32)	Organizational Procedures (7.00)
Affective Processes (7.26)	Affective Processes (6.80)

Insight about differences in specific administrative skills are evident by reviewing the items with the most differences between the recognized and random groups (Table 3). Six of the first nine items with the most differences in mean scores between the two groups were from the factor of Organizational Linkage. These items describe skills of utilizing resources from outside the school to assist the school; providing for dissemination of information to individuals and agencies in the community; and, developing plans for the cooperation and involvement of the community.

Table 3
Audit of Principal Effectiveness Items With Most Differences Between Means of Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group

Factors	Item	Mean Scores Recognized Group N=174	Random Group N=132	Difference
Organizational Linkage	9	7.61	6.74	.83
Organizational Linkage	11	7.52	6.81	.71
Organizational Linkage	10	7.20	6.49	.71
Affective Processes	64	7.56	6.87	.69
Teacher Relations	40	8.07	7.42	.65
Organizational Linkage	17	7.69	7.06	.63
Organizational Linkage	8	7.63	7.00	.63
Organizational Direction	5	8.06	7.44	.62
Organizational Linkage	15	7.88	7.27	.61
Organizational Direction	1	7.70	7.11	.59
Organizational Direction	3	8.38	7.83	.55

Specific skills associated with providing a direction or mission for the school were evident in the three items with the most differences between the two groups of principals. The items described the principals' abilities to envision future goals and directions for the school; assist the faculty in developing understanding of, and support for, beliefs and attitudes which form the basis for the educational value system of the school; and, set high professional expectations for self, faculty and school. Two other items with noticeable differences between the recognized and random groups addressed issues of pride and confidence. One item described the principal's ability to share personal thoughts about school issues which help teachers develop a sense of pride and loyalty as members

of the school. The other described the principal's ability to manage the day-by-day operations of the school effectively, thus promoting among staff, parents and community, a feeling of confidence in the school.

Only ten of the eighty items in the instrument did not test as significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. These items are presented in Table 4. Among the ten were four items from the factor of Student Relations, four from Teacher Relations and one each from Organizational Linkage and Organizational Procedures. The Student Relations items included skills of high visibility to the student body; finding time to interact with students; enjoying working with students; and, creating a relationship where students feel free to initiate communication with the principal. The Teacher Relations items were the skills of creating an atmosphere where teachers feel at ease in the presence of the principal; being accessible when needed; taking the time to listen to teachers; and, creating relationships where teachers feel free to share ideas and concerns with the principals. The organizational linkage item that was not statistically different between the two groups was the ability of the principal to maintain good rapport and a good working relationship with other administrators of the district. The Organizational Procedures item was the ability of the principal to fairly and effectively evaluate school personnel.

Table 4

T-Tests of Audit of Principal Effectiveness Item Scores Not Significantly Different Between Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group

Factors	Item	Mean Scores Recognized N=174	Random N=132	p Level
Student Relations	46	7.43	7.45	.8981
Student Relations	41	7.20	7.16	.7802
Organizational Linkage	13	7.98	7.88	.2321
Teacher Relations	32	7.41	7.21	.1611
Student Relations	48	7.79	7.63	.1478
Organizational Procedures	22	7.52	7.35	.1180
Student Relations	42	7.24	7.03	.1048
Teacher Relations	35	7.40	7.16	.0731
Teacher Relations	36	7.77	7.58	.0623
Teacher Relations	37	7.58	7.35	.0572

Tests for differences between the factor scores for the recognized group and the random group are presented in Table 5. With the exception of Student Relations, each factor score was significantly different at the .05 level of confidence. The difference for Student Relations was nearly significant at the .05 level. The lack of statistical difference for Student Relations implies that the principals of the recognized schools do not work more effectively with students than principals from the random group. If this finding remains constant after additional research, several explanations appear plausible. For example, student enrollment in the recognized schools is greater than the national average (Wilson, 1987). The larger the school, the less the opportunity to work with students. Another explanation might be that the principals of the recognized schools invest more time in other administrative tasks, particularly instructional leadership tasks, and thus less time with students. Certainly, the differences for the factors of Instructional Improvement (7.6 recognized vs 7.2 random) and Curriculum Improvement (7.5 recognized and 7.0 random) imply this emphasis.

Table 5

T-Tests of Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores for Significant Differences Between Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group

Domains and Factors	Mean Scores Recognized N=174	Random N=132	Diff.	p Level
Organizational Development				
Organizational Direction	7.8	7.3	.5	.0001
Organizational Linkage	7.7	7.2	.5	.0001
Organizational Procedures	7.3	7.0	.3	.0001
Organizational Environment				
Teacher Relations	7.5	7.2	.3	.0046
Student Relations	7.5	7.3	.2	.0581
Interactive Processes	7.8	7.4	.4	.0001
Affective Processes	7.3	6.8	.5	.0001
Educational Program				
Instructional Improvement	7.6	7.2	.4	.0005
Curriculum Improvement	7.5	7.0	.5	.0001

The data from this study do not confirm or reject these explanations about Student Relations. However, the data do provide overwhelming evidence that the teachers in the recognized schools perceive their principals as more effective than do the teachers in the random schools.

Each teacher who completed the Audit also responded to several demographic questions. The data were analyzed for the following questions. "How many years have you been a teacher?" "How many years have you taught at this level?" "How many years have you worked as a teacher with this principal?" "Were you hired by the principal you are assessing?" "Are you male or female?" "Do you have any administrative responsibilities in the school?" Though generally predicatble, the responses from the various sub-groups for each of these questions are pertinent for principals attempting to understand the differences in perceptions among various faculty groups.

Perceptions of the teachers in the recognized schools and the random schools were not significantly different for "years of experience." For the variable "years taught at this level," responses from the teachers in the recognized schools did not differ. In the random schools, responses for "years taught at this level" differed for the factors of Organizational Procedures and Teacher Relations. In both cases the responses from teachers in the six to twelve years range were significantly lower than the teachers with less than two years.

The most noticeable difference among variables associated with "years" was for the "years the teacher had worked with the principal," (Table 6). From the recognized schools, only the factor of Student Relations was different. But for the random schools, each factor had significantly different responses. In the random schools the perceptions of the teachers who had worked from six to twelve years with the principal were significantly lower than the perceptions of teachers who had worked thirteen or more years with the principal. Perhaps the longer years together in the random schools produced more understanding, more friendship, more comfortableness with the principal and/or lower levels of expectations. Perhaps the middle years of six to twelve represented those years when the "honeymoon" was over and the number of differences of opinion had accumulated sufficiently to generate a lower rating. These are speculative, not confirmed, reasons for the differences among the random sample.

The differences between the random and recognized groups may be due to the ability of the principals from the recognized schools to relate to, and work equally well with, all teachers regardless of the years they have worked together. Perhaps the principals of the recognized schools are so noticeably competent that all staff see the competence, regardless of the number of years they have been together. Perhaps the principals of the recognized schools make so many more quality decisions that teachers do not develop enough differences of opinion over time to become disgruntled to the same degree as in the random schools. While plausible, these too are only

speculative reasons. Additional studies will be necessary to determine if these findings are consistent over time and if so, what the causes of the differences might be.

Table 6

Differences for Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores for Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group by Years Teacher has Worked with the Principal

Domains and Factors	Mean Scores Recognized N=1305				Random N=947			
Years:	0-2	3-5	6-12	13+	0-2	3-5	6-12	13+
Organizational Development								
Organizational Direction	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.4	7.2	7.0	7.7*
Organizational Linkage	7.7	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.1	7.0	6.9	7.6*
Organizational Procedures	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.1	6.8	6.6	7.3*
Organizational Environment								
Teacher Relations	7.6	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.4	7.0	6.8	7.4*
Student Relations	7.7	7.5	7.3	7.6*	7.4	7.1	6.9	7.4*
Interactive Processes	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.9	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.7*
Affective Processes	7.3	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.0	6.6	6.4	7.2*
Educational Program								
Instructional Improvement	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.7	7.3	7.1	6.8	7.3*
Curriculum Improvement	7.9	7.8	7.9	8.0	7.6	7.3	7.1	7.8*

* Significantly different at .05 level

Teachers in the recognized schools who were hired by the principals they were assessing rated seven of the nine factors significantly higher than did the teachers hired by a previous principal (Table 7). Student Relations and Curriculum Improvement were not different. The ratings from the teachers in the random schools did not differ for any factor. Why the teachers hired by the effective principals were so significantly different while those hired by the random principals were not different is not clear from this study. Perhaps the effective principals are better at hiring teachers who understand the issues the principals wish to implement and the strategies for accomplishing those plans. Perhaps the principals of the recognized schools are more likely to hire teachers who view

education much the same as the principal. Whatever the reasons, the teachers hired by the principals of the recognized schools appear to be more supportive of the principals' efforts than the teachers hired by the random group of principals.

Table 7

Differences for Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores for Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group by Who Hired the Teacher or whether the Teacher was Hired by the Principal

Domains and Factors	Mean Scores			
	Recognized N=1305		Random N=947	
Hired by Principal:	YES	NO	YES	NO
Organizational Development				
Organizational Direction	7.9	7.7*	7.3	7.2
Organizational Linkage	7.7	7.6*	7.2	7.0
Organizational Procedures	7.5	7.2*	7.1	6.9
Organizational Environment				
Teacher Relations	7.6	7.4*	7.2	7.1
Student Relations	7.5	7.5	7.2	7.2
Interactive Processes	7.9	7.7*	7.5	7.3
Affective Processes	7.4	7.1*	6.9	6.7
Educational Program				
Instructional Improvement	7.6	7.4*	7.2	7.1
Curriculum Improvement	7.5	7.3	7.0	6.9

*Significantly different at .05 level.

Male teachers consistently rated the principals lower than female teachers (Table 8). This was true for the recognized and the random schools. In the recognized schools, the differences were statistically significant for all factors; but, in the random group the differences were significant only for Affective Processes, Instructional Improvement and Curriculum Improvement. Similar research by Battle (1982) and Spalding (1987) support the finding that female teachers consistently view principals' efforts as more effective than do male teachers. Explaining the reason for this phenomenon is difficult. Females may simply be "kinder" when they assess. They may have

differing levels of expectations. They may better understand the complexities of the position. Or, males may expect more because the males are more frequently from a background of coaching or quasi-administrative duties. Or, males may expect more because they are more likely to have administrative certificates, but are not yet administrators. All are possible explanations, but researchers seem to lack a clear understanding of which one or more might be the causal factor or factors.

Table 8

Differences for Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores for Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group by Sex of the Teacher

Domains and Factors	Mean Scores			
	Recognized N=1305		Random N=947	
Sex of Teacher:	Female	Male	Female	Male
Organizational Development				
Organizational Direction	7.9	7.6*	7.3	7.1
Organizational Linkage	7.8	7.5*	7.2	7.0
Organizational Procedures	7.4	7.1*	7.0	6.8
Organizational Environment				
Teacher Relations	7.6	7.4*	7.2	7.1
Student Relations	7.6	7.3*	7.3	7.1
Interactive Processes	7.9	7.6*	7.4	7.3
Affective Processes	7.3	7.0*	6.9	6.5*
Educational Program				
Instructional Improvement	7.4	7.2*	7.2	7.0*
Curriculum Improvement	7.3	7.0*	7.0	6.7*

*Significantly different at .05 level.

Teachers from the recognized schools who have administrative responsibility rated their principals significantly higher than teachers without administrative responsibilities for each factor except Organizational Direction and Interactive Processes (Table 9). Organizational Direction is the ability to work with staff to identify school goals, establish expectations for the school and promote appropriate change. The factor of Interactive Processes represents the ability of the principal to organize the tasks and personnel for

effective day-by-day management of the school. It is interesting that the teachers who work most closely with the principals do not view these two factors which are so closely associated with the school effectiveness research as more positive than the teachers without administrative responsibilities. In the randomly selected schools, there were no differences between the perceptions of teachers with and without administrative responsibility.

Table 9

Differences for Audit of Principal Effectiveness Factor Scores for Nationally Recognized Group and Random Group Administrative Responsibility of the Teacher

Domains and Factors	Mean Scores Recognized N=1305		Random N=947	
Administrative Responsibility:	YES	NO	YES	NO
Organizational Development				
Organizational Direction	7.9	7.8	7.3	7.2
Organizational Linkage	7.7	7.6*	7.2	7.1
Organizational Procedures	7.5	7.2*	7.0	6.9
Organizational Environment				
Teacher Relations	7.6	7.4*	7.1	7.2
Student Relations	7.6	7.4*	7.2	7.2
Interactive Processes	7.8	7.7	7.3	7.4
Affective Processes	7.4	7.1*	6.8	6.7
Educational Program				
Instructional Improvement	7.3	7.1*	7.2	7.1
Curriculum Improvement	7.3	7.1*	7 0	6.9

*Significantly different at .05 level.

Conclusions

Each of the factors and items in the Audit of Principal Effectiveness was developed from the literature and research on principal and school effectiveness and the logical application of these principles to the administration of a school. Each factor is well grounded in research and practice. Accepting the validity of the

instrument and the process used by the Department of Education to identify the recognized schools, it is not suprising that the principals of schools which have received national recognition are perceived by their teachers as more effective than principals from a random sample of schools. While there may be some "halo effect" creating inflated perceptions by the teachers of the recognized schools, the differences are so consistently evident they must represent some degree of reality. Clearly, the teachers of the recognized schools perceive their principals as more effective than teachers of the random schools. The pattern of differences between the perceptions of the teachers surveyed in this study supports the belief that more effective schools are administered by more effective principals.

REFERENCES

Battle, M. W. (1982). Teacher perception of male and female communication style. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Bowman, M. L. and Valentine, J. W. (1987). Audit of principal effectiveness: A user's technical manual. (Available from J. Valentine, 218 Hill Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65211).

Spalding, S. A. (1987). Teacher perception of male and female principal effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

United States Department of Education (1987). The school recognition program: A historical perspective. Unpublished report available from Department of Education.

Wilson, B. L. and Corcoran, T. B. (1987). Places where children succeed: A profile of outstanding elementary schools. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, (p.9).